

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-170059
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-1106403(B)
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
SAVOY C. WALKER,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant Savoy C. Walker was placed on community control after having been convicted of 11 counts of theft in office in violation of R.C. 2921.41(A)(2). The trial court was subsequently notified by Hamilton County Adult Probation that Walker had violated Rules 1, 7, and 10 of her community control. Walker was arrested and brought before the trial court for a hearing on the violations. Through counsel, Walker waived the probable-cause hearing and entered a guilty plea to the violations. The trial court found Walker guilty of violating Rule 7, which related to unauthorized travel, and Rule 10, which related to payment of financial sanctions. The trial court then imposed the prison terms Walker had been told she would receive when she was originally placed on community control.

In one assignment of error, Walker claims that her due-process rights were violated when the trial court failed to determine if she was entering her plea knowingly, explain the effect of her plea, explain that upon accepting her plea the trial court could proceed with judgment and sentence, and explain that her plea would foreclose her ability to call witnesses or confront the witnesses against her. Walker's argument is without merit.

The requirements of Crim.R. 11(C)(2) do not apply to a community-control-violation hearing. *State v. Alexander*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-070021, 2007-Ohio-5457, ¶ 7. A defendant faced with revocation of community control is not afforded the full panoply of rights given to a defendant in a criminal prosecution. *Id.* A revocation hearing is an informal one, “structured to assure that the finding of a * * * violation will be based on verified facts and that the exercise of discretion will be informed by an accurate knowledge of the [defendant's] behavior.” *Id.*, quoting *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 480, 92 S.Ct. 2593, 33 L.Ed.2d 484 (1972). Before a trial court imposes a prison term for the violation of the conditions of community control, the court must hold a hearing at which the defendant is present and apprised of the grounds for the violation. *See* Crim.R. 32.3(A). At the hearing, the defendant is entitled to counsel. *See* Crim.R. 32.3(B).

All the requirements of Crim.R. 32.3 were met in this case: a hearing was held, Walker was present with counsel at the hearing, and she was informed of the grounds of the community-control violation. A hearing tantamount to a Crim.R. 11 plea hearing was not required. We overrule Walker’s sole assignment of error and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

A certified copy of this judgment entry is the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

MOCK, P.J., CUNNINGHAM and MYERS, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on March 2, 2018
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge